UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,021	06/20/2003	Jordi Albornoz	ROC920030230US1	8486

7590	02/13/2006	

William J. McGinnis, Jr.
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
EBIRIM, EMEKA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/600,021	ALBORNOZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emeka Ebirim	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 June 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-37</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/20/2003</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1.   The application has been examined and claims 1-37 are rejected as detailed

below and are pending in this office action.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Contents of

paragraphs 0025 and 0027 appear to be duplicates of each other.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

MPEP 2106 IV.B.2.(b)

4.   A claim that requires one or more acts to be performed defines a process. However, not
all processes are statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101. Schrader, 22 F.3d at 296, 30 USPQ2d at 1460.
To be statutory, a claimed computer-related process must either: (A) result in a physical
transformation outside the computer for which a practical application in the technological arts is
either disclosed in the specification or would have been known to a skilled artisan, or (B) be
limited to a practical application within the technological arts.

5.   Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 25-26 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's

disclosure, specification paragraph 0034, the medium is not limited to tangible

embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g.,

floppy disks) and intangible embodiments (e.g., communications medium). As such, the

claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Amending the claims to recite "computer readable storage medium" would

overcome the rejections.

Double Patenting

6.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created
doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the
unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent
and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory
obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims
are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct
from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated
by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140
F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29
USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.
1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422
F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ
644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d)
may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory
double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to
be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of
activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a
        terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply
        with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7.   Claims 1,2,15,25,30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,3,12,18,21 of

copending Application No. 10/600014 in view of US patent No 6,956,593 to Gupta et al

(hereinafter Gupta).

8.   The following table shows the claims in Instant Application No: 10/600021 that

are rejected by corresponding claims in Application No: 10/600014.

<u>Claims Comparison Table</u>

Instant application No 10/600021	Application No: 10/600014
Claim 1	Claim 1
Claim 2	Claim 3
Claim 15	Claim 12
Claim 25	Claim 18
Claim 30	Claim 21

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

from each other because the scopes of their respective elements are similar.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to include or omit "annotation structure" and "application

programming interface" because its inclusion would have served to create a coherent

interface to ensure a high quality user experience in viewing annotations [See Gupta

Col 2 line 10-15, Col 7 lines 27-30, Col 6 line 54].

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the

conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9.	The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10.	Claims 1-4,6,8-26,30-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

US patent No 6,956,593 to Gupta et al (hereinafter Gupta).

<u>Claim 1</u>.

Gupta discloses:

A method for exchanging information between entities on a network comprising:

installing an annotation management system on the network [network, install,

annotation server, annotations managed, Col 3 lines 59-62 Col 2 line 18-20, Col 5 line

63, Col 4 line 5];

identifying a plurality of annotatable data objects manipulated by a plurality of

applications on the network [network, annotation is data, object, data structures, Col 4

lines 28-31,Col 1 lines 21, 63-65];

providing a set of annotation structures, each associated with one or more of the

annotatable data objects [structure for annotation, Col 7 lines 27-30, Fig 4]; and

providing, via the annotation management system, one or more interfaces for

manipulating annotations for the annotatable data objects, wherein the information

presented in each interface is dependent on an associated one of the annotation

structures [annotation system, interface for creating annotation, Col 1 line 66, Col 2

lines 20-22].

Claim 2.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein the one or more interfaces comprise at least one

graphical user interface, based on an associated annotation structure [interface for

creating and viewing annotations, Col 2 lines 20-22].

Claim 3.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 2, wherein providing the at least one graphical user

interface comprises transforming the associated annotation structure [graphical user

interface, Col 11 lines 59-65].

Claim 4.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 3, further comprising providing one or more transforms for use in transforming annotations structures into graphical user interfaces [change (transform) annotation, graphical user interface, Col 24 lines 1-2, lines 9-18].

Claim 6.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 1, further comprising installing one or more plug-in components for interfacing between the one or more applications and the annotation management system [install, plug-in, annotation system, manage, Col 5 line 63, Col 6 lines 54-55, Col 1 line 66, Col 4 line 5].

Claim 8.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 1, further comprising installing a set of application programming interface functions for the annotation management system, callable from the one or more applications [programming interface, interface module, install, Col 6 line 54, Col 12 lines 3-5, Col 5 line 63].

Claim 9.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 8, wherein the set of application programming interface functions comprise functions for manipulating annotations [authored (manipulate) annotation, control information, Col 7 lines 3-4].

Claim 10.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 8, wherein the set of application programming interface functions comprise functions for retrieving annotations for a specified data object [search field, retrieve annotation, Col 16 lines 35-38].

Claim 11.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 8, wherein the set of application programming interface functions include functions for retrieving an indication of data objects described by an annotation [search field, retrieve annotation, objects, Col 16 lines 35-38 Col 4 line 29].

Claim 12.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 8, wherein the set of application programming interface functions comprise at least one function for retrieving an indication of the plurality of annotatable data objects [Col 16 lines 60-64].

Claim 13.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 1, wherein providing the annotation structures comprises selecting, for each annotation structure, one or more annotation fields to include in the annotation structure [Col 16 lines 60-64].

Claim 14.

The method of claim 13, wherein at least some of the one or more interfaces for manipulating the annotatable data objects allow a user to enter information corresponding to one or more annotation fields included in an associated annotation structure [enter data, Col 8 lines 48-49].

Claim 15.

Gupta discloses:

A method of creating annotations for a plurality of different type data objects manipulated by a plurality of applications, comprising [create annotation, Col 2 line 26]:

receiving a request from a user to create an annotation for a data object [receives request to create annotation, Col 2 line 30-31];

retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with the data object, each annotation structure containing one or more annotation fields [retrieve annotation, Col 16 lines 38-39];

generating a graphical user interface based on one of the annotation structures,

the graphical user interface allowing entry of the one or more annotation fields

associated with the one annotation structure [graphical user interface, entry, Col 11

lines 63-63, Col 8 lines 48-49, Fig 8-10]; and

creating an annotation record comprising the information entered, via the

graphical user interface, for the one or more annotation fields [add annotation record,

GUI, Col 12 lies 56-59, Fig 8-10,Col 14 lines 40-48].

Claim 16.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 15, wherein the one or more annotation structures retrieved

depends, at least in part, on at least one credential of a user initiating the request [Col

17 lines 31-36].

Claim 17.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 16, wherein the at least one credential comprises a role of

the user [Col 17 lines 31-36].

Claim 18.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 15, wherein a plurality of annotation structures are associated with the data object and the method further comprises [annotation structures, Col 7 lines 27-30]:

presenting, to a user, the plurality of annotation structures associated with the data object[Col 15 lines 40-42, Col 13 lines 25-27];

receiving, from the user, a selection of one of the plurality of annotation structures[select, receive, annotate Col 2 lines 29-34]; and

generating the graphical user interface based on the selected annotation structure[Col 12 lines 3-5, Fig 22, Fig 23].

Claim 19.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 18, further comprising receiving, from the user, a selected role in which the user has chosen to act [select a set, Col 12 lines 65-67, Col 13 lines 1-5].

Claim 20.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 19, wherein the plurality of annotation structures presented to the user is dependent on the selected role [supports access control, Col 13 lines 1-5, Col 16 lines 1-6].

Claim 21.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 19, further comprising:

retrieving, via an application programming interface, a plurality of roles

associated with the user [select a set, retrieve, application program interface, Col 12

lines 65-67, Col 13 lines 1-5, Col 16 lines 38-39, Col 6 line 54]; and

presenting, to the user, the plurality of roles associated with the user [Col 6 lines

33-35].

Claim 22.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 15, wherein retrieving one or more annotation structures

associated with the data object comprises passing an application programming interface

function at least an indication of the data object [application programming interface,

passing, Col 6 lines 54,Col 7 lines 1-2].

Claim 23.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 22, wherein retrieving the one or more annotation structures

associated with the data object further comprises passing the application programming

interface function at least one credential of a user [application programming interface,

retrieve, Col 6 lines 54,Col 16 lines 38-39].

Claim 24.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 22, wherein the at least one user credential comprises at

least one of a role and a user identification [user identification, Col 7 line 40-42].

Claim 25.

Gupta discloses:

A computer-readable medium containing an executable component for managing

annotations created for data objects manipulated by one or more applications on a

network which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising:

receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a

data object [Col 12 lines 47-50, Fig 6-7];

retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with the data object.

each annotation structure containing one or more annotation fields [select different

annotation structure, text, audio, URL, Col 13 lines 25-28];

generating a graphical user interface based on one of the annotation structures,

the graphical user interface allowing entry of the one or more annotation fields

associated with the one annotation structure [Col 14 lines 58-65, Col 15 lines 10-33, Fig

8-10]; and

creating an annotation record comprising the information entered, via the

graphical user interface, for the one or more annotation fields [add annotation record,

GUI, Col 12 lies 56-59, Fig 8-10,Col 14 lines 40-48].

Claim 26.

Gupta discloses:

The computer-readable medium of claim 25, wherein receiving a request from

one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object comprises receiving the

request from a plug-in component that provides an interface between the requesting

application and the executable component for managing annotations [plug-in,

application programming interface, interface for creating annotation, manage annotation

Col 6 lines 54-55, Col 2 lines 20-22, Col 4 line 5].

Claim 30.

Gupta discloses:

A system for managing annotations for different type data objects manipulated by

a plurality of different type applications, comprising [Col 1 lines 33-34]:

an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data objects

associated with the annotations [Col 7 lines 7-11, Fig 1, 3];

a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields [Fig 8-10,

Col 14 lines 58-65, Col 15 lines 10-33];

an annotation server configured to receive requests, issued by the applications,

to access annotations for data objects identified in the requests [annotation server,

annotation identifiers, Fig 3, 4, Col 3 lines 59-62, Col 7 lines 34-35]; and

a set of application programming interface functions providing an interface

between the applications and the annotation server [application programming interface,

annotation server, Col 6 lines 54-58].

Claim 31.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 30, further comprising a set of application plug-ins, each

specific to one or more of the applications and configured to communicate with the

annotation server via the application programming interface functions [application

programming interface, annotation server, plug-in Col 6 lines 54-58].

Claim 32.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 30, wherein the annotation server is configured to retrieve,

via one or more application programming function calls, annotations associated with a

data object identified in a request [select different annotation structure, text, audio, URL,

Col 13 lines 25-28].

Claim 33.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 31, wherein the annotation server is configured to:

retrieve, via a first application programming function call, one or more annotation identifications associated with the data object identified in the request [select different annotation structure, text, audio, URL, Col 13 lines 25-28]; and

using the annotation identifications, retrieve, via a second application programming interface function call, the corresponding annotations from the annotation store [annotation data store, annotation identification, interface, Col 7 lines 30-34, line 55].

Claim 34.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 30, wherein the annotation server is configured to:

retrieve, via an application programming interface function call, a list of one or more roles associated with a user [function for accessing (call), annotation server, application programming interface, Col 6 lines 54-57, 65-67]; and

present, to the user, the one or more roles associated with the user [Col 16 , lines 1-6, Col 13 lines 1-5].

Claim 35.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 33, wherein the annotation server is further configured to:

receive, from the user, a selected one of the one or more roles associated with

the user [Col 16 , lines 1-6, Col 13 lines 1-5]; and

indicate to the system, via an application programming interface function call, the

role selected by the user [Col 16 lines 1-6].

Claim 36.

The system of claim 29, wherein the annotation server is configured to:

retrieve, via an application programming interface function call, annotation

structures associated with data objects identified in requests [annotation structure,

application programming interface, objects, data structures, Col 7 lines 27-29, Col 6

line 54, Col 4 lines 29-30 Fig 4, 3] ; and

transform the annotation structures into graphical user interfaces for creating

annotations for the data objects [change (transform) annotation, graphical user

interface, Col 24 lines 1-2, lines 9-18].

Claim 37.

The system of claim 36, wherein the annotation server is further configured to

retrieve, via an application programming interface function call, one or more transforms

associated with an annotation structure for use in transforming the annotation structure

into a graphical user interface [Col 24 lines 1-2, lines 9-18].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13.   Claims 5,7,27,28,29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over US patent No 6,956,593 to Gupta et al (hereinafter Gupta), in view of Pub No. US

2002/0184401 to Kadel JR et al (hereinafter Kadel).

<u>Claim 5.</u>

Gupta discloses the elements of claim 4 as indicate above but does not explicitly

indicate wherein the one or more transforms comprise one or more Extensible

Stylesheet Language transforms.

Kadel discloses the claimed "Extensible Stylesheet Language transforms" However, Kadel teaches the claimed "Extensible Stylesheet Language transforms" [see Kadel paragraph 0316].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the cited references because "Extensible Stylesheet Language transforms" of Kadel's disclosure would have allowed Gupta to independently transfer structured data, and single number with associated unit of measurement between programs.

Further more, "Extensible Stylesheet Language transforms" would have served to allow Gupta's system the ability to develop, integrate, and interoperate with disparate sources of information and thus develop software applications, components, or objects to facilitate interoperation between software components.

Claim 7.

Gupta discloses:

The method of claim 6, further comprising installing an annotation broker on the one or more client computers, the annotation broker providing an interface between one or more of the plug-in components and the annotation server [Col 5line 63, Col 6 lines 54-55].

Gupta discloses the elements of claim 6 as indicate above but does not explicitly indicate "broker". However, Kadel teaches the claimed broker [see Kadel paragraph 0316]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the cited references because "broker" of Kadel's disclosure would have allowed Gupta to independently transfer structured data, and single number with associated unit of measurement between programs.

Further more, "broker" would have served to allow Gupta's system the ability to develop, integrate, and interoperate with disparate sources of information and thus develop software applications, components, or objects to facilitate interoperation between software components.

Claim 27.

Gupta discloses:

The computer-readable medium of claim 26, wherein receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object comprises receiving the request from an annotation broker that provides an interface between plug-in components of one or more applications and the executable component for managing annotations [plug-in, application programming interface, interface for creating annotation, manage annotation Col 6 lines 54-55, Col 2 lines 20-22, Col 4 line 5] .

Gupta discloses the elements of claim 27 as indicate above but does not explicitly indicate "broker". However, Kadel teaches the claimed "broker" [see Kadel paragraph 0316].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the cited references because "broker" of Kadel's disclosure would have allowed Gupta

to independently transfer structured data, and single number with associated unit of

measurement between programs.

Further more, "broker" would have served to allow Gupta's system the ability to

develop, integrate, and interoperate with disparate sources of information and thus

develop software applications, components, or objects to facilitate inter operation

between software components.

Claim 28.

Gupta discloses:

A system for managing annotations for different type data objects manipulated by

a plurality of different type applications, comprising [Col 1 lines 33-34] :

an annotation database for storing annotations separately from the data objects

associated with the annotations[Col 7 lines 7-11, Fig 1, 3];

a set of annotation structures, each defining a set of annotation fields [Fig 8-10,

Col 14 lines 58-65, Col 15 lines 10-33];

a set of plug-in components, each specific to one or more applications running on

a client computer, configured to communicate with an annotation server [Col 12 lines 3-

13, Col 6, line 54]; and

an annotation server configured to receive, via the annotation broker, requests to

access annotations issued by the one or more of the applications running on the client

computer and generate a graphical user interface screen, based on an annotation

structure associated with the data object identified in the request, for creating or viewing

annotations for a data object identified in the request [Fig 8-10, Col 14 lines 58-65, Col 15 lies 10-33, Col 12 lines 47-50, Fig 6,7].

Gupta discloses the elements of claim 27 as indicate above but does not explicitly indicate "broker". However, Kadel teaches the claimed "broker" [see Kadel paragraph 0316].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the cited references because "broker" of Kadel's disclosure would have allowed Gupta to independently transfer structured data, and single number with associated unit of measurement between programs.

Further more, "broker" would have served to allow Gupta's system the ability to develop, integrate, and interoperate with disparate sources of information and thus develop software applications, components, or objects to facilitate inter operation between software components.

Claim 29.

Gupta discloses:

The system of claim 28, wherein the one or more applications are installed on a client computer and the annotation system further comprises an annotation broker providing an interface between the one or more plug-in components and the annotation system [plug-in, interface, annotation system, Col 6 lines 54-55, Col 1 line 66].

Gupta discloses the elements of claim 27 as indicate above but does not explicitly indicate "broker". However, Kadel teaches the claimed "broker" [see Kadel paragraph 0316].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the cited references because "broker" of Kadel's disclosure would have allowed Gupta to independently transfer structured data, and single number with associated unit of measurement between programs.

Further more, "broker" would have served to allow Gupta's system the ability to develop, integrate, and interoperate with disparate sources of information and thus develop software applications, components, or objects to facilitate inter operation between software components.

Contact Information

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emeka Ebirim whose telephone number is 571-272-3994. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30pm - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Name: Emeka Ebirim
Art Unit: 2166

KHANH B. PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER